



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,282	08/31/2001	Lucas Merrow	57622-048 (ELZK-8)	3806

7590 10/11/2002

McDermott, Will & Emery  
28 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2697

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/945,282

Applicant(s)

MERROW ET AL.

Examiner

Md Shafiul Alam Elahee

Art Unit

2697

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 10 (fig.1). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 28. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,333,180) and in view of Szlam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,594,791).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Brown teaches, a call message delivery system (CDS) providing a voice message service in response to a voice call message delivery request from a caller, uses the called station number (col.1, lines 38-64; 'CDS' reads on the claimed 'an

Art Unit: 2697

automated calling system' and 'called station number' reads on the claimed 'target person's telephone number'). He further teaches, if the message delivery is an attendant-supervised delivery, CDS 120 checks, (fig. 5, step 501) if any pre-recorded names must be played. If so, the caller's name is played in the introductory message (fig. 5, step 503); otherwise, attendant can say the caller's name and the recipient's name to the answering party (fig. 5, step 502) and the attendant inquires if the designated recipient is available (fig. 5, step 504; 'introductory message' reads on the claimed 'initiating a prerecorded greeting which asks for the target person'). He further teaches, if the recipient response option is chosen, (fig. 3, step 309), then an appropriate entry 747(fig. 7) is made. He further teaches, when the start time is reached, (fig. 6, step 602), CDS 120 locates a voice recognition equipment for call answer monitoring assistance (col. 16, lines 49-53; 'voice recognition equipment for call answer monitoring assistance' reads on the claimed 'speech recognition application'). However, he does not explicitly teach, "performing a speech recognition analysis on said spoken response". Szlam teaches the customer's response is preferably provided using DTMF tones but voice recognition is also an option and decision 526 (fig. 5) evaluates the response of the customer to the query (col.16-19). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brown to allow CDS performing a speech recognition analysis as taught by Szlam. The motivation for the modification is to allow CDS performing a speech recognition analysis in order to make a selection without requiring the person who answers the call to press his DTMF keypad.

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Brown further teaches, the attendant inquires if the designated recipient is available (col.15, lines 47-48; fig.5, step 504).

Regarding claims 3 and 13, Brown further teaches the attendant waits for the recipient to answer the call (col.15, lines 48-49; fig.5, step 509).

Regarding claims 4 and 14, Brown further teaches, if the recipient is not available (col.15, lines 60-62; fig.5, step 504), then, CDS 120 checks if the message-taker option was selected by the caller (col.15, lines 60-62; fig.5, step 505). If so, the attendant asks if the answering party can take the message (col.15, lines 62,63; fig.5, step 506).

Regarding claims 5 and 15, Brown further teaches, if the answering party can take the message then, attendant pushes the auto-message key and drops off the call (col.15, lines 63-65; fig.5, step 509). SU 123 makes an appropriate entry, 722 (fig.7, table 720).

5. Claims 6-8, 10, 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,333,180) and in view of Szlam et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,594,791) and further in view of Miner et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,652,789).

Regarding claims 6 and 16, Brown and Szlam as applied to claims 1 and 11 above differs from claims 6 and 16 in that Brown and Szlam fail to teach "if said speech recognition analysis determines that said spoken response is a hold request, a next step comprises entering a wait state to wait for said target person to provide a spoken response to said telephone call". Miner teaches the option for the subscriber of accepting the call, asking the system to place the caller on hold while he completes his present call (col.8, lines 36-39; 'subscriber' reads on the claimed 'target person'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Brown as modified by Szlam, further including the speech recognition analysis to determine that spoken response is a hold request and enter a wait state to wait for target person to provide a spoken response to telephone call as taught by Miner. The

Art Unit: 2697

motivation for the modification is to allow the system to wait for the particular person for the particular message.

Regarding claims 7 and 17, Brown and Szlam fail to teach "upon said target person providing a spoken response to said telephone call, said method further comprises initiating a speech recognition application with said target person". Miner teaches, when the subscriber has completed his other call, he instructs the system to establish a direct connection with the new caller (col.8, lines 40-49). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brown and Szlam to allow target person providing a spoken response to telephone call after being available as taught by Miner. The motivation for the modification is to allow the system to selectively deliver the message to the particular person to keep the secrecy of the message.

Regarding claims 8 and 18, Brown and Szlam as applied to claims 1 and 11 above differs from claims 8 and 18 in that Brown and Szlam fail to teach "if said speech recognition analysis determines that said spoken response is a request for the identity of the entity responsible for the calling system, the method further comprises initiating a prerecorded response indicating the identity of the calling party". Miner teaches the system attempting to recognize the caller by playing prerecorded response (col. 7, lines 18-37). If the system succeeds in recognizing the caller on the basis of his phone number, it then plays the prerecorded message and stores the identity of the contact (col.7, lines 38-50). It then attempts to locate the subscriber (col.7, lines 51-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brown and Szlam to allow the system to identify the entity responsible for the calling system and to initiate a prerecorded response indicating the identity of

the calling party as taught by Miner. The motivation for the modification is to allow the calling system to provide identity of the calling party and the target person.

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Brown and Szlam as applied to claims 1 and 11 above differs from claims 10 and 20 in that Brown and Szlam fail to teach "if said speech recognition analysis cannot determine a status of said spoken response, said method further comprises repeating, said prerecorded greeting which asks for the target person". Miner further teaches electronic assistant mediating the connection when a contact tries to reach the subscriber (col.2, lines 20-22) and performing a speech recognition analysis on spoken response of the subscriber (col.6, lines 26-37). If the subscriber is not accepting any calls (col.7, lines 66,67), the system plays a prerecording message (col.8, lines 1,2). The system may also send a message notifying the subscriber of the call and identifying the caller (col.8, lines 33-35). Then the subscriber has the option of accepting the call, asking the system to place the caller on hold while he completes his present call (col.8, lines 36-39). When the subscriber has completed his other call, he instructs the system to establish a direct connection with the new caller (col.8, lines 40-49). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brown and Szlam to allow the system to repeat prerecorded greeting which asks for the target person if the speech recognition analysis cannot determine a status of spoken response as taught by Miner. The motivation for the modification is to allow the calling system to make sure the availability of the target person.

6. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,333,180) and in view of Szlam et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,594,791) and further in view of Szlam et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,828,731).

Regarding claims 9 and 19, Brown teaches, if no retry time was specified by the answering party (fig. 5, step 510), then CDS 120 checks (fig. 5, step 511), if the wrong recipient telephone number was given by the caller. If a wrong number was given, then the attendant asks if a call forwarding number is available (fig. 5, step 518) and if so, then the attendant enters the new number and drops off the call (fig. 5, step 519). However, if no call forwarding number is given (fig. 5, step 518), then the attendant presses the wrong number key and drops off the call (fig. 5, step 512). However, Brown and Szlam'791 fail to teach "initiating a prerecorded apology message". However, it would be very obvious, as taught by Szlam'731 patent, for generating an apology message to the call recipient for apologizing for the wrong call. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brown to play an apology message indicating that a wrong number was made and terminating the call (col.2, lines 51-58, fig. 2B) as taught by Szlam'731. The motivation for the modification is to allow the calling system to make a call to a correct phone number.

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,333,180) and in view of Szlam et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,594,791) and further in view of Miner et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,652,789).

Regarding claims 21(A)-21(D), Brown teaches, a call message delivery system (CDS) providing a voice message service in response to a voice call message delivery request from a caller, uses the called station number (col.1, lines 38-64; 'CDS' reads on the claimed 'an automated calling system' and 'called station number' reads on the claimed 'target person's telephone number'). He further teaches, if the message delivery is an attendant-supervised delivery, CDS 120 checks, (fig. 5, step 501) if any pre-recorded names must be played. If so, the



Art Unit: 2697

caller's name is played in the introductory message (fig. 5, step 503); otherwise, attendant can say the caller's name and the recipient's name to the answering party (fig. 5, step 502) and the attendant inquires if the designated recipient is available (fig. 5, step 504; 'introductory message' reads on the claimed 'initiating a prerecorded greeting which asks for the target person'). He further teaches, if the recipient response option is chosen, (fig. 3, step 309), then an appropriate entry 747(fig. 7) is made. He further teaches, when the start time is reached, (fig. 6, step 602), CDS 120 locates a voice recognition equipment for call answer monitoring assistance (col. 16, lines 49-53; 'voice recognition equipment for call answer monitoring assistance' reads on the claimed 'speech recognition application'). However, he does not explicitly teach, "performing a speech recognition analysis on said spoken response". Szlam teaches the customer's response is preferably provided using DTMF tones but voice recognition is also an option and decision 526 (fig. 5) evaluates the response of the customer to the query (col.16-19). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brown to allow CDS performing a speech recognition analysis as taught by Szlam. The motivation for the modification is to allow CDS performing a speech recognition analysis in order to make a selection.

Regarding claim 21(E)(b), Brown further teaches, the attendant inquires if the designated recipient is available (col.15, lines 47-48; fig.5, step 504) and the attendant waits for the recipient to answer the call (col.15, lines 48-49; fig.5, step 509).

Regarding claim 21(E)(c), Brown further teaches, if the recipient is not available (col.15, lines 60-62; fig.5, step 504), then, CDS 120 checks if the message-taker option was selected by the caller (col.15, lines 60-62; fig.5, step 505). If so, the attendant asks if the answering party

Art Unit: 2697

can take the message (col.15, lines 62,63; fig.5, step 506) and if the answering party can take the message then, attendant pushes the auto-message key and drops off the call (col.15, lines 63-65; fig.5, step 509). SU 123 makes an appropriate entry, 722 (fig.7, table 720).

Regarding claim 21(E)(d), Brown and Szlam fail to teach “if said speech recognition analysis determines that said spoken response is a hold request, a next step comprises entering a wait state to wait for said target person to provide a spoken response to said telephone call” and “upon said target person providing a spoken response to said telephone call, said method further comprises initiating a speech recognition application with said target person”. Miner teaches the option for the subscriber of accepting the call, asking the system to place the caller on hold while he completes his present call (col.8, lines 36-39; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claimed ‘target person’). Miner further teaches, when the subscriber has completed his other call, he instructs the system to establish a direct connection with the new caller (col.8, lines 40-49). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Brown as modified by Szlam above, to allow speech recognition analysis to determine that spoken response is a hold request and enter a wait state to wait for target person to provide a spoken response to telephone call and target person providing a spoken response to telephone call after being available as taught by Miner. The motivation for the modification is to allow the system to wait for the particular person for the particular message and selectively deliver the message to the particular person to keep the secrecy of the message.

Regarding claim 21(E)(e), Brown and Szlam further fail to teach “if said speech recognition analysis determines that said spoken response is a request for the identity of the entity responsible for the calling system, the method further comprises initiating a prerecorded

Art Unit: 2697

response indicating the identity of the calling party”. Miner further teaches the system attempting to recognize the caller by playing prerecorded response (col. 7, lines 18-37). If the system succeeds in recognizing the caller on the basis of his phone number, it then plays the prerecorded message and stores the identity of the contact (col. 7, lines 38-50). It then attempts to locate the subscriber (col. 7, lines 51-56). It then attempts to locate the subscriber (col. 7, lines 51-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Brown, as modified by Szlam and Miner above, to allow the system to identify the entity responsible for the calling system and to initiate a prerecorded response indicating the identity of the calling party as taught by Miner. The motivation for the modification is to allow the calling system to provide identity of the calling party and the target person.

Regarding claims 21(E)(f), Brown teaches, if no retry time was specified by the answering party (fig. 5, step 510), then CDS 120 checks (fig. 5, step 511), if the wrong recipient telephone number was given by the caller. If a wrong number was given, then the attendant asks if a call forwarding number is available (fig. 5, step 518) and if so, then the attendant enters the new number and drops off the call (fig. 5, step 519). However, if no call forwarding number is given (fig. 5, step 518), then the attendant presses the wrong number key and drops off the call (fig. 5, step 512). However, Brown and Szlam fail to teach “initiating a prerecorded apology message”. Since it would be very obvious to generate an apology message for a wrong call, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Brown, as modified by Szlam and Miner above to play an apology message indicating that a wrong number was made and terminating the call (col. 2, lines 51-58, fig. 2B).

Art Unit: 2697

The motivation for the modification is to allow the calling system to make a call to a correct phone number.

Regarding claims 21(E)(g), Brown and Szlam further fail to teach "if said speech recognition analysis cannot determine a status of said spoken response, said method further comprises repeating, said prerecorded greeting which asks for the target person". Miner teaches electronic assistant mediating the connection when a contact tries to reach the subscriber (col.2, lines 20-22) and performing a speech recognition analysis on spoken response of the subscriber (col.6, lines 26-37). If the subscriber is not accepting any calls (col.7, lines 66,67), the system plays a prerecording message (col.8, lines 1,2). The system may also send a message notifying the subscriber of the call and identifying the caller (col.8, lines 33-35). Then the subscriber has the option of accepting the call, asking the system to place the caller on hold while he completes his present call (col.8, lines 36-39). When the subscriber has completed his other call, he instructs the system to establish a direct connection with the new caller (col.8, lines 40-49). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Brown, as modified by Szlam and Miner above, to allow the system to repeat prerecorded greeting which asks for the target person if the speech recognition analysis cannot determine a status of spoken response as taught by Miner. The motivation for the modification is to allow the calling system to make sure the availability of the target person.

8. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlam et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,828,731) and in view of Brown et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,333,180).

Regarding claim 22, Szlam teaches the apparatus for processing outbound calls which includes initiating an outbound call, determining whether said outbound call has been answered

Art Unit: 2697

by a machine and playing termination message if outbound call was answered by a machine (col.3, lines 31-39, fig.1). Szlam further teaches two ways of detecting an answering machine (col.8, lines 21,22). If a live person answers a telephone call then the initial greeting will be very short followed by a period of silence where the answering party waits for the calling party to reply and if the calling party does not reply then the answering party will repeat the greeting and wait again for the reply (col.8, lines23-28). The message on an answering machine allows the calling party to reply until the message has been completely delivered and therefore, one method of determining whether an answering is present is to measure the duration (col.8, lines 29-48). However, Szlam fails to teach “with an automated calling system” and “initiating a prerecorded greeting which asks for the target person”. Since it would be very obvious to generate a greeting by an automated calling system, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Szlam as modified by Brown to allow a call message delivery system (CDS) providing a voice message service in response to a voice call message delivery request from a caller, uses the called station number (col.1, lines 38-64; ‘CDS’ reads on the claimed ‘an automated calling system’ and ‘called station number’ reads on the claimed ‘target person’s telephone number’) and if the message delivery is an attendant-supervised delivery, CDS 120 checks, (fig. 5, step 501) if any pre-recorded names must be played. If so, the caller's name is played in the introductory message (fig. 5, step 503); otherwise, attendant can say the caller's name and the recipient's name to the answering party (fig. 5, step 502) and the attendant inquires if the designated recipient is available (fig. 5, step 504; ‘introductory message’ reads on the claimed ‘initiating a prerecorded greeting which asks for the target person’). The

motivation for the modification is to allow the calling system to introduce him to the target person so that the target person would be able to make a selection.

9. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlam et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,828,731) and in view of Brown et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,333,180) and further in view of Szlam et al.( U.S. Patent No. 5,594,791).

Regarding claim 23, Szlam'731 as applied to claim 22 above differs from claim 23 in that Szlam'731 fails to teach "tone during the playing of said prerecorded greeting prompt and, upon the detection of a beep tone, interrupting the prerecorded greeting prompt and playing a prerecorded answering machine message prompt". Brown teaches the recipient to hear an announcement (fig.4, step 419) and a tone (fig.4, step 420), prompting for the recording of the recipient's response, if a recipient's reply is requested. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Szlam'731 as modified by Brown to allow the system to hear a beep tone output by an answering machine as taught by Szlam'791. The motivation for the modification is to allow the calling system to hear the tone in order to insure whether the live person is answering the telephone.

Regarding claim 23, Szlam'731 and Brown as applied to claim 22 above differs from claim 23 in that Szlam'731 and Brown fail to teach "detect a beep tone". Szlam'791 teaches the controller 11 (fig.1) establishing several queues for each campaign, one of which is an intercept queues containing lists of the records for which predetermined three-tone intercepts were detected (col. 9, lines 35,36,52-54; 'predetermined three-tone intercepts were detected' reads on the claimed 'to detect a beep tone'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Szlam'731 and Brown to allow the

Art Unit: 2697

calling system to detect the tone as taught by Szlam'791. The motivation for the modification is to allow the calling system to detect the tone in order to insure the answering machine's message prompt.

Regarding claim 24, Szlam'731 as applied to claim 23 above differs from claim 24 in that Szlam'731 fails to teach "tone during the playing of said prerecorded answering machine message prompt and, upon the detection of a beep tone, interrupting said prerecorded answering machine message prompt and replaying said prerecorded prompt". Brown teaches the recipient's response (reply) to be recorded accordingly (fig.4, step 421), and stored in 904 of Voice File 901(fig. 9) and SU 123 determines if a response has been recorded (fig.4, step 422). This may be determined by detecting recipient speech during a certain time interval. If a reply is recorded (fig.4, step 423), SU 123 plays a concluding announcement ('plays a concluding announcement' reads on the claimed 'replaying said prerecorded prompt'), terminates the call, makes a message delivered entry 703 and 724, respectively, in tables 700 and 720 (fig. 7), and makes a reply obtained entry 723 in table 720 (fig. 7). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Szlam'731 to allow the answering machine to replay prerecorded prompt as taught by Szlam'791. The motivation for the modification is to insure the alignment of the answering machine message prompt with the answering machine recorder.

### *Conclusion*

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2697

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE  
October 7, 2002

FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Fan Tsang', written in a cursive style.